1	UNREDACT	ED TRANSCRIPT
2	T	
3	FOR THE WESTERN	TATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE N DIVISION
4	EASIEN	N DIVISION
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA .	
6	VERSUS	. NO. 1:08-CR-10102-JDB-1
7	MICHAEL R. LEMONS	. JACKSON, TENNESSEE . 1:20 P.M.
8		
9		
10		
11	APPEAL TRANSCRIPT	
12	SENTENCING HEARING PROCEEDINGS MAY 13, 2010	
13	DEEODE MIE HONODADIE I DANIEL DDEEN	
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE J. DANIEL BREEN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
15		
16	<u>APPEARANCES</u>	
17	FOR THE UNITED STATES:	MR. JERRY R. KITCHEN ASSISTANT U. S. ATTORNEY
18		300 FEDERAL BUILDING
19		109 SOUTH HIGHLAND AVENUE JACKSON, TENNESSEE 38301
20		MG M DINNIE GMOEWEDG
21	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	MS. M. DIANNE SMOTHERS ASSISTANT FEDERAL DEFENDER
22		105 FEDERAL BUILDING 109 SOUTH HIGHLAND AVENUE
23		JACKSON, TENNESSEE 38301
24	COURT REPORTER:	CHRISTINE MARTIN, OCR, RPR
25		P. O. BOX 10373 JACKSON, TENNESSEE 38308

(Defendant present)

THE COURT: All right, we're set this afternoon in the matter of U. S. versus Michael Lemons, 08-10102.

Is the government ready to proceed this afternoon?

MR. POWELL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is the defendant ready to proceed?

MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right, counsel, I've received and reviewed your -- well, the presentence report as well as your position papers.

Mr. Powell, did you have any -- I don't think there were any objections by the government, was there, sir?

MR. POWELL: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you have anything you needed to take up?

MR. POWELL: We have four exhibits. They are numbered sequentially 1 through 4, and they are, respectively, the waiver in indictment number 9311 from Maury County, judgments in those -- count 1 and count 2 in that same case, and then a reporter's transcript of the entry of the plea of guilty dated February 2, 1996.

Ms. Smothers and I each have copies, and I have prepared these copies and we are submitting them to the court with

no objections.

**THE COURT:** No objections?

MS. SMOTHERS: No, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Smothers, let me go ahead and take up your objections that you've lodged in this matter. I believe you had --

MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

**THE COURT:** Paragraph 15?

MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir. And we still maintain our objections as we have basically set them out, Your Honor. I don't know that I can add a tremendous amount by way of argument to Your Honor today. I think we've basically set out the basis for our argument.

We had initially -- I think Mr. Powell and I both initially, after extensive contact with the Maury County court system, with the clerk and the office of the clerk, had not had documentation, as you can see from my objections themselves. They're simply -- We simply had a copy of the judgment, and that was all that we had at that point, which indicated pro se, that there was nothing behind it that had been provided, and we have requested repeatedly for that documentation, and it simply wasn't provided.

The documentation we did receive which did exist is what Your Honor now has as exhibits 1, 2 and 3.

I, nevertheless, maintain our objections. Obviously, he did sign a waiver of counsel. There's a little X mark there on the box and he's signed that document as far as the waiver of a jury trial and, I think, proceeding by information in that case.

I would like to call Mr. Lemons just very briefly about the circumstances of this event and that plea for the record if we could do that, and I think that's basically the proof we would want to present. I'd like to be heard as far as disposition with some other matters, but if I could call him briefly.

THE COURT: All right, come around.

## MICHAEL LEMONS, THE DEFENDANT, WAS DULY SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MS. SMOTHERS:

- Q Let me ask you, you're Mike Lemons; correct?
- 17 A Yes, ma'am.
- 18 Q Michael Lemons.
  - Let me ask you to go back, if you would, and I know this is quite a ways back, but back in 1996 in Maury County, did you appear in court about some burglary petitions?
- 23 A Yes, ma'am.
- 24 Q How did you get there? I mean physically.
- 25 A I was on probation out of Jackson. I was working at

a place called Club Alibi outside of Jackson, Tennessee. And at night, whenever I got off work, I was walking to a girl's house that I was dating. She lived in an apartment complex. There had just been a fight up there at the apartment complex, and police officers were leaving there, and they saw me walking on the street, on the side of the road, and it was probably about two o'clock in the morning, and picked me up. When they did, I didn't have any ID on me, so they asked me my name, and I told them my name was Michael Lemons, and they ended up running an NCIC and had a hit for a fugitive from justice out of Maury County, Tennessee. And when you said you were on probation here, is that the burglary case that was in Madison County back in '94? Yes, ma'am. Α Okay. So were you taken to jail here, then to Maury County, or what?

A I was taken to jail in, I think, Lexington. I think that's where -- I don't remember exactly which town it was. I think it was Lexington. I was taken there. I sat there for about two or three days before Maury County came and

got me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q So did you then go to the Maury County jail?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall how long you were there before you ever

1 were in court about that case? I went to court one time and was there for roughly 2 Α 3 about a month, maybe a few weeks to a month. 4 Q Before you went to court, you mean? 5 Α Yes, ma'am. 6 Okay. So your recollection is you actually appeared 7 in court one time. 8 Yes, ma'am. Α 9 And the whole thing was done in one day, one event. 10 Yes, ma'am. Α 11 MS. SMOTHERS: Your Honor, might I show him the exhibits? 12 13 THE COURT: You want the transcript too? 14 MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir, Your Honor, just --BY MS. SMOTHERS: 15 I'm showing you exhibits 1, 2, 3 and 4. 16 17 THE COURT: You can put them on the screen. 18 assume they've already been marked. 19 MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: That way everybody can see them. 21 MS. SMOTHERS: Okay. If I can get them to fit. 22 BY MS. SMOTHERS: 23 This has been marked as exhibit 1, "Waiver of Trial by Jury and Petition to Enter Plea of Guilty." Do you 24

recall who filled in or do you know who filled in this top

1 information? 2 Α No, ma'am. 3 Okay. You don't recall that you did it. 4 Α No, ma'am. This is a two-sided document. I'm showing you 5 Okay. 6 the backside of that document. 7 THE COURT: You might want to pull it up a 8 little bit. 9 MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir. It's a little 10 difficult to read. 11 BY MS. SMOTHERS: Again, there's some language at the top. It sets out 12 13 the recommendation for the punishment. But looking at 14 this, 6 February of '96 and this signature, whose signature is that? 15 16 The signature is definitely mine. 17 Okay. Do you know if you filled out any of the other 18 items other than the signature? 19 By looking at the February and the 6th, no, they 20 shouldn't be mine. 21 THE COURT: Should or should not? 22 THE WITNESS: Should not. 23 BY MS. SMOTHERS:

Q And let me just ask you, and these documents reference it but your signatures are not on any other

24

- items. What sentence do you recall getting? What was the punishment?
- 3 A What they gave me was five years -- as I understand,
- 4 | they gave me five years on top of the Jackson probation to
- 5 | run together, which gave me a total of thirteen years
- 6 intense probation. I had eight out of Jackson already.
- 7 The reasoning was that that charge happened before, the one 8 in Jackson.
- 9 Q And where were you to actually be supervised?
- 10 | A In Jackson, Tennessee.
- 11 | Q Where were you living at that time?
- 12 | A In Jackson.
- 13 Q So you weren't in Maury County at the time.
- 14 | A No.
- 15 Q When you went to court -- You said you went to court
- 16 that first time. Let me ask you first, how old were you
- 17 when you did this plea?
- 18 A I'd say 19 years old.
- 19 | O Okay. At that time --
- 20 A Nineteen, twenty.
- 21 Q Okay. At that time, was there any problem that you
- 22 were having as far as personal with drug use, alcohol use,
- 23 that type of thing?
- 24 | A No, ma'am.
- 25 Q Had you graduated high school?

- A No, ma'am. I graduated from Knoxville Job Corps in '89 in Knoxville.
  - Q Is that like a GED or is that some other --
  - A GED.

4

- 5 Q GED. All right. So you had that.
- 6 A Yes, ma'am.
- 7 Q You can read and write then. That's not an issue.
- 8 A Yes, ma'am.
- 9 Q Do you recall about, from your recollection, how long
  10 you were in court? I mean an hour, all day, ten minutes,
  11 what?
- A It wasn't very long. I'd say maybe five, ten
  minutes, just long enough for them to tell me what I got,
- 14 then they released me ROR, I guess.
- 15 Q You were to report to somebody back here in Madison 16 County --
- 17 | A Yes.
- 18 Q -- or were you already being supervised here?
- 19 A I was already being supervised here in town, and they
- 20 were supposed to contact my probation officer in Jackson
- 21 and let him, I guess, add the five years to it, I guess, or
- 22 whatever.

court.

- 23 Q You said you sat for about a month, or several weeks
- 24 | at least, in the Maury County jail before you went to
- 25

- Α Yes, ma'am.
- 2 Did you ever during that period of time speak to a
- 3 lawyer?

- The only other person I talked to was the 4 Α
- 5 investigators. The investigators are the ones that came
- 6 and talked to me from the beginning.
- 7 When you say the investigators, you mean from the
- sheriff or police? 8
- 9 Α Yes, ma'am.
- 10 Law enforcement officers.
- 11 Yes, ma'am.
- Okay. Did you ever -- Before you were standing in 12
- 13 court, did you ever speak with the prosecuting attorney
- 14 about the charges or what the options were --
- 15 Α No, ma'am.
- 16 -- before you were there? Okay.
- 17 And when you were in court -- Obviously, we see the
- 18 paperwork, and it says, I'm waiving my right to counsel.
- 19 Do you recall a public defender or any attorney of that
- 20 type being there in court?
- 21 No, ma'am. Α
- 22 Was anyone else in court other than you in your case?
- 23 Yeah, the courtroom was full of people, but I never
- 24 talked to anybody else. I didn't even remember signing the
- 25 paperwork, you know.

```
How did you get -- This may sound like a strange
question, but how did you get home? What happened after
you left the courtroom?
```

Okay, whenever I left the courtroom, I -- I'm from Jackson, Tennessee. I never even remember being in Maury County. And I asked them, Well, how do I get back to Jackson? And they told me to go to the nearest church, that there was a church down the road in town, and I went to the church, and the church was able to get me a bus ticket. The pastor carried me to the bus station and got me a bus ticket and waited for me to be able to get on the bus to get back to Jackson.

- Okay, so you came back home, back to Jackson.
- Α Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

21

22

23

24

- 15 And that's the last contact you had with Maury 16 County --
- 17 Α Yes.
- 18 -- about any of that. 0
- 19 Α Yes, ma'am.
  - All right. Do you recall the judge explaining to you as you were going through this process that if you pled guilty and got convicted, if you got in trouble later you could get -- it could cause you more trouble, get you a worse sentence or make you in a higher category or anything like that?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Through them, no. I was under the impression it was
all going straight to Jackson. Of course, if I did
anything in that county, you know, it would go through
Jackson and be violated there. But as to Maury County, I
had no other tie-in as far as I knew.
      Why did you -- I mean you're 19 years old. Why did
you sign these papers?
      I don't know. I don't know. Maybe the deal sounded
too good. I don't know.
     Did you know what would happen if you didn't sign
them? Did you have a thought as to where you would be if
you didn't sign them?
Α
     No.
Q
     Okay.
           MS. SMOTHERS: I think that's all I have, Your
Honor.
            THE COURT: Mr. Powell?
           MR. POWELL: No questions, Your Honor.
                                                   Thank
you.
           THE COURT: You can step down, sir.
           Any additional proof you want to present?
           MS. SMOTHERS: No, sir, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: So is it my understanding that
basically the objection is to the extent that the
defendant -- it all revolves around this conviction that
```

occurred in Maury County?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Powell, I'll hear from you.

MR. POWELL: Your Honor, I don't have anything There's nothing to indicate these aren't valid, to add. knowing, voluntary pleas that were entered by the defendant, valid judgments that were entered in Maury County, and the presentence report is accurate.

THE COURT: Okay.

Ms. Smothers?

MS. SMOTHERS: Well, Your Honor, as I've indicated, our objections were filed before either side, the government or the defense, had ultimately obtained those Maury County documents that are entered as exhibits now. And my initial objection was that we simply had a pro se plea -- I'm sorry, a judgment that indicated pro se without any other knowledge as to what happened.

But even in light of these documents which came from the clerk, and Mr. Powell and I both received them and we can't dispute those documents are the documents that come from that prior court proceeding, then what you have is a man who's 18 years old, apparently, as the event was alleged to have occurred, 19 when he pled. We still maintain our objection that to have a knowing and voluntary waiver -- and there's no doubt there was a waiver. I mean

it's signed. It's got a check mark and he signed it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And he acknowledged to the judge that he was doing that.

MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir. Yes, sir, he did.

THE COURT: I probably would have asked him to say yes or no, but apparently the court picked up his nod.

> MS. SMOTHERS: It indicates he was nodding.

**THE COURT:** He nodded yes on everything that he was asked by Judge Hamilton.

MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir.

And again, there's no -- what we don't see -and again, it's -- As he testified, you know, there's very -- The plea, actually, the colloquy, is even more limited and bare bones, if you will. The documents themselves actually have quite a bit more information than the plea colloquy itself as far as background for the waivers and those matters.

But I would still request Your Honor to consider whether this admitted plea was a knowing and voluntary waiver, not so much voluntary, but knowing, again, with a man -- a young man who's 19 years old taken to a county where he doesn't really have any contact, apparently was there on a very minimal level, didn't even know how to get back home or really where he was in relation to Jackson, I think, once he stepped out of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

courthouse. That in that situation, in light of the constitutional aspect of it being a knowing waiver, there's no indication, and as he indicated, that he was under the influence of drugs or alcohol or something like that that would affect the voluntariness of it. But as far as the knowing aspect, I think a barely 19-year-old defendant, admittedly without counsel, who apparently, other than being interrogated by the officers, literally never saw anybody for several weeks and then was brought to court and this was done. And I find that somewhat shocking. Obviously, it's what happened, and the judgment went down. It's long since expired. I mean, the five-year supervision was over, you know, years and years ago.

But, nevertheless, it's our position that there's still a constitutional question as to whether it is a knowing waiver, largely in light of his shockingly young age. He was an adult, absolutely, no doubt. He's a teenager but, legally, he's an adult.

THE COURT: But is there anything -- I mean, you know, you obviously pointed out he was 19 or 20, whatever he was.

> MS. SMOTHERS: Nineteen, yeah.

THE COURT: But what do I have in front of me that indicates he didn't understand what he was doing?

MS. SMOTHERS: I think just the totality --

THE COURT: Besides his age.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think just the totality, Your MS. SMOTHERS: Honor. And again, we're not saying he was, you know, kidnapped under cover of darkness and whisked away. I'm not trying to imply that, but simply that he's taken halfway across the state to another county. He apparently sits in jail for several weeks, close to a month, and then officers from either the county or the city, I'm not sure who, questioned him, and he's brought into court at some later date. It's obviously a docket or some type of a routine report because the courtroom is full of people. And then in a matter of minutes, okay, here's your plea. You just go on home, head on home, get on a bus or whatever. He signs it and is gone. And I think, again, the -- I know the papers say he's literate. There's no dispute he was literate. But again, given his -- given his youth and the fact that he's away from home, had been away from home for several weeks, apparently without contact, basically, with anybody, just kind of waiting for someone to take him on the next step to get him to court, I think would go to whether the waiver was knowing.

And so we still maintain our objection as far as that -- I say sentence, or the two matters that -- that docket number 9311 counting as far as the armed career. don't -- We have no other documentation to present.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think we set that out, basically, in our response, and Mr. Powell has as well.

But I'd like to address the court, if I might, regarding disposition. I didn't know if Your Honor wanted to wait till -- as far as where to serve the sentence and that type of thing.

THE COURT: We'll get to that in just a minute.

MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Powell, is there anything else you wanted to add?

> MR. POWELL: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Well, the convictions which counsel argues should not be, I guess, considered because they were -- there's no indication they were knowing and voluntary or that, I think, Mr. Lemons was too young or he had been away from home or something of that nature, this, as the court reviews the presentence report, was not his first foray into the criminal justice system. He had a previous conviction in '95 for theft over \$1,000. He had another conviction in '94 for driving offenses. And he had another conviction for aggravated burglary and carrying a deadly weapon in '95 in Madison County. So he had already had at least three -- Let me make sure I'm not missing something. He actually had something as a juvenile, but at least three adult convictions before he ever got to Maury

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

County and pled guilty to the two aggravated burglaries.

Before me, I have a document, exhibit 1, a waiver of trial by jury and a petition to enter a plea of guilty, that has a check mark, even though Mr. Lemons says he didn't put some of this other information on here, but where it's check-marked it says, I waive my right to have counsel appointed for me, and then his signature, which he admits that's his signature on there.

If that were in and of itself, there might be some question, but I also have a transcript of the proceedings on that day with Judge Hamilton where he started out by asking him, said, Do you want to -- You have indicated by signing the criminal information that you want to proceed by that as opposed to having the case submitted to the Maury County grand jury. And he says: Do you understand that you have that right and you can waive that and proceed by what we call a criminal information, and is that what you want to do? And Mr. Lemons acknowledges he did.

Then he says: Do you want me to allow that? And again, he acknowledges that.

And then he also says: You signed a document that says you want to waive your right to trial by jury and want to enter a plea of guilty. Is that correct? And the defendant answers: Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then he says: Do you understand what you're charged with? And he says: Now, are you represented by an attorney?

And I think Mr. Colbert, who I think was the DA, I believe that's correct -- well, I'm not sure if Mister -- Let's see. There was someone by the name of Mr. Colbert who steps in and says: Judge, he wants to represent himself.

And Judge Hamilton asked Mr. Lemons again: All right, is that correct? And Mr. Lemons acknowledges that he did.

(Reading) So, Mr. Lemons, you are representing yourself today? And again, he acknowledge that he did.

And Judge Hamilton said: You understand if you want a lawyer, I'll appoint you one, but do you want to do it this way and represent yourself? And again, Mr. Lemons acknowledged that he did.

Then he went on further to say that he had a right to a trial by jury, would appoint an attorney to represent him there, that he can assist him with witnesses, and then he goes through the other rights. Then Judge Hamilton asked him, he said: Is there anything you don't understand about what I just said? And Mr. Lemons said no, or shook his head no.

And then he proceeds to tell him what he's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

being charged with. Then he said: Are you in fact guilty of those charges? That's correct? And Mr. Lemons said yes.

Then he asked him if he was promised or threatened, had anybody done that, and he said no.

You know, with all of this information, not only with the transcript and the -- in conjunction with the Waiver of Trial by Jury and Petition to Enter Plea of Guilty, it seems to me that Mr. Lemons made a knowing and voluntary waiver of his right to counsel and that he freely and voluntarily entered a plea of guilty to the charges in 1996, February 6, 1996, for two counts of aggravated burglary, and the court will overrule the objection that these were not appropriate or voluntary waivers, and I will overrule Ms. Smothers' objection to that.

All right, what else?

MS. SMOTHERS: Just if I can address Your Honor concerning --

Sure. You can go ahead and do that THE COURT: now.

> MS. SMOTHERS: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Your Honor, in light of Your Honor's ruling, obviously we're faced with, I would offer, a Draconian sentence, a drastic sentence. That's what the statute provides, like it or not. But, still, if you look at this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

situation, Mr. Lemons' situation, individually in light of -- and I think it's set out in the presentence report. All of these events, '94, the event which gave rise to the Maury County plea, happened in like January of '94. Then the -- it's paragraph 29 of the presentence report. That event happened in December of '94. It was pled earlier, but it happened later that same year. So the Maury County was the last plea, although it was not the last event to occur in time.

But I say all that to say, basically, '96 even comes too far forward. You would say '94 is when those events happened, the last of this conduct. And as the report sets out, and we can't dispute it, he was to be supervised here. He moved -- as the report indicates, he moved out West and was apparently living there, working there, did not get into trouble. The report doesn't show a bunch of arrests or problems or any kind of -- those type of issues for years and years.

He comes back to Tennessee. His mother lives She's here today. And that's where his family -here. where his mom is. He comes back here, and it's my understanding -- And the officers -- one of the officers is here today. But it's my understanding right before this case came to be, there basically was a roundup, if you will, of just old outstanding warrants that were sitting

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

around at the sheriff's department or the police department in an effort to clean up files and address those hanging matters. There was a warrant for either absconding or probation violation where -- because he was gone. He simply had not reported. It would have been, I suppose, a technical violation. No new crime, if you will, but just didn't report. And they track him down through utility They go to his house. He's there, and here we are today. The gun is found when they come to arrest him on that old warrant. It had been out since the late '90s. It just had never been served on him but was still a valid warrant, and that's what brought us here today.

Unfortunately, because of the statutory construct of 924(e), he's facing a shockingly severe sentence compared to someone who had maybe even less history or somewhat similar history but, you know, went out and robbed a bank or something. I mean this sentence is It binds the court. It's statutory. absolute.

And what I would ask Your Honor to consider as far as service of the sentence, both where and the wording of our order in relation to some of these other matters, this man is not someone who's been out continuing to behave in an unlawful way, other than being gone and not reporting. And clearly, that's a violation of his conditions of probation. We don't dispute that. But he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

wasn't out robbing banks, selling drugs, doing any of the other things that folks could do in the intervening decade and more, twenty -- a long time.

I say all that to say that paragraph 29, that that sentence on June 28, '08, he was revoked to serve that sentence. It's my understanding that he had been paroled, basically was paroled to the federal hold. But regardless, as Your Honor sees in the language, the sentence won't expire until June 3, 2014. I would ask Your Honor to fashion this judgment, because of this long intervening time -- and unfortunately, again, under armed career criminal, they never age out. If these convictions were forty years old, he would be facing the same sentence. he had led a 110 percent law-abiding life for forty years post-plea, he'd be facing this same sentence. There's nothing else in the statute or guidelines that causes that kind of result other than this armed career. And I don't think there's any other word other than Draconian to describe that sentencing scheme. But that's where we are right now.

I would ask Your Honor to state in this judgment, to rule that this sentence, whatever it may be, is to be concurrent with and he's to be given sentence credit for any time that he has served on paragraph 29, that Madison County Circuit number 95-155. Again, I think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor has discretion to fashion either a consecutive or a concurrent sentence, to fashion this sentence in a variety of ways. But given the unusually long time line without any indication of other illegal activity other than he just didn't report, he moved away, and when he came back years later, apparently, there he is not bothering anybody, going to work, and we end up here today.

He has served -- He's been in custody since he was arrested. He has served, apparently, what the state wants from him on that case; but, nevertheless, I'm confident the Bureau of Prisons will not likely give him credit for that time because it was credited on that case.

The same thing is true with paragraph 27, which is those Madison County cases -- I'm sorry, which is that Madison County case 94-1472. Again, he's revoked June 28th to serve the balance of that sentence. It expired July --It will expire July 9th of this year, 2010.

I'm asking Your Honor -- and it is somewhat unusual, but I'm asking Your Honor to state in this judgment that this sentence on the federal case is to be concurrent -- well, maybe the better way to say that is he's to be given sentence credit on the federal case for any time he has served in custody on paragraph 29 or paragraph 27, those Madison County cases, because, again, this is -- I think it is an unusual case. This man hasn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

been a thorn in the law enforcement side for fifteen years, just kept getting in trouble until they finally caught him with a gun. He was doing nothing with the gun. It was a long gun, basically apparently there, I guess, for home protection, as any number of folks have. Unfortunately, he can't have one. But we'd ask Your Honor to state that he's to be given credit on this sentence for any days he has served on those sentences.

I would also request -- And again, the length of the sentence may preclude this initially, but I would still request on his behalf that Your Honor recommend that he be housed at a low-security camp. Again, I'm confident the Bureau of Prisons administrative regs will prevent that initially in this sentence, but at some point he will come down to a term where he could be camp-eligible. It's my understanding that now, with a ten-year or less sentence, that you would be normally considered for camp participation or placement. I would ask Your Honor to make that recommendation, again, because of the unbelievable length of time between these priors and where we are today, where he was at the time that he was found with the gun, which, hopefully, would assist him in being, I would offer, in a housing situation and in a classification that would more accurately reflect what he's been doing and who he is as opposed to just the number of months on paper, which if

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

you look at that just in a vacuum in the case, he's a really bad apple and there must be something awful going on because he's got this big sentence. But again, he's just someone whose priors are never going to age out. If he gets out and comes back in court at age 65 with a gun charge, he'd be looking at this same sentence. It makes no difference. And I would offer to you that's patently unfair, although that's what the statute says.

But I think to avoid some of that, we ask that Your Honor give him credit for any days served on those sentences and make a recommendation for the camp and also for substance abuse treatment. I think there's historically been an issue with that. He may be largely past it now, but we do request it on his behalf because there has been an element of that in his past history.

That's all our requests today.

THE COURT: Mr. Powell?

MR. POWELL: Well, Your Honor, just two I'll take them in reverse order of Ms. Smothers' matters. presentation.

I would submit to the court that because it is an unusual case does not establish a lawful basis for a lower sentence.

THE COURT: I think she's wanting credit. Not necessarily concurrent, but credit, I guess.

1 MR. POWELL: Well --2 THE COURT: Six one half dozen or the other. MR. POWELL: Call it credit, concurrent 3 4 sentencing, it is exactly what the court has just said. 5 And part of the factual basis that belies that reasoning is 6 her same argument that these happened so long ago, the cases from '94 and '96. It's hard to fathom how that makes 7 8 creditworthy in this case that it occurred when it did. 9 The other thing is Ms. Smothers' statement of 10 if he had lived a law-abiding life. And if he had lived a 11 law-abiding life, he wouldn't be here today. It's that The reason that we are here with Mr. Lemons is 12 13 because he didn't do what he was supposed to do. If he had 14 done what he was supposed to do, this case never would have 15 occurred. 16 THE COURT: All right, sir. 17 Anything else, Ms. Smothers? 18 No, sir, Your Honor. MS. SMOTHERS: 19 THE COURT: Mr. Lemons, the court will permit 2.0 you to say anything on your own behalf if you wish to do so 21 at this time, sir. 22 I need something for the record. Just tell me 23 you don't want to say anything. 24 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: You don't? Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

All right, in this matter Mr. Lemons had previously pled guilty to count 1 of the indictment charging him with being a convicted felon in possession of a firearm in violation of 18, United States Code, Section 922(g).

The court is utilizing the guidelines as advisory, and in doing so I'm referring to the 2008 edition of the guideline manual, which under that condition, under Section 2K2.1(a)(4)(A), Mr. Lemons would be at an offense level of 20. However, based upon Section 4B1.4(b)(3)(B), Mr. Lemons qualified as an armed career criminal because he has had three or more violent felony -- excuse me, violent felony offenses, which under 18, United States Code, Section 924(e)(2)(A), would be subject to an enhanced sentence, and that would place his -- actually, that's a mandatory minimum enhanced sentence, and that would place his offense level at 33.

And I'm assuming the government moves for the -- You may have already moved for the additional point under acceptance. Did you, Mr. Powell?

MR. POWELL: Yes, Your Honor. I filed a motion.

THE COURT: All right, the court will grant your motion and give Mr. Lemons a full three-level reduction for acceptance. That reduces his offense level to a 30.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Under his criminal history category, he has three criminal history points based upon the '95 aggravated burglary and carrying a deadly weapon. He also has two additional points based upon the fact that at the time of the instant offense he was on probation under Section 4A1.1(d). That gives him five criminal history points. That would have otherwise placed him in criminal history category III, but because of the armed career criminal status, he -- well, excuse me. Because of 4B1.1(4)(c), he's under criminal history category IV -- excuse me, under criminal history category IV. That, based on the guideline range, his advisory range, under that scenario, would recommend a range of 135 to 168 months.

The court is also to consider the factors under 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a), which directs the court to impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) of the subsection.

The court, in determining the sentence to be imposed, is to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and history and characteristics of the defendant. Of course, the nature and circumstances I think have been outlined here. To my understanding, there was a joint operation, I believe, by U. S. Attorney's office and -- or,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

excuse me, I apologize, by the Madison County agents and -local, state and federal, I quess. It was a joint effort among all three agencies to work various warrants. And in an arrest roundup in this area, Mr. Lemons was found based upon -- I believe as Ms. Smothers indicated, for an outstanding -- I believe it was a probation violation warrant, and that in going to his residence there was found a Hi-Point 9mm carbine rifle, and I believe the officers knew that Mr. Lemons was a convicted felon. And for that reason he was prosecuted in this court for that particular offense.

There was no indication that he was using the gun in any other way. He just had it, I guess maybe for protection, not like some situations we find where someone is utilizing it in conjunction with some other offense. But nonetheless, Congress has seen fit to prohibit persons who are felons from possessing or being around firearms. And statistically, I guess that's an appropriate basis simply because so many felons do, regretfully, commit offenses with firearms or other destructive weapons and --Anyway, certainly that's their prerogative, and which they have done.

The history and characteristics. Mr. Lemons, as Ms. Smothers pointed out, the vast majority of his prior record emanated from the '90s, and there's been no

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

indication of any subsequent -- Let me make sure I'm not missing something here. No indication of subsequent arrests by authorities. Picking up on what Mr. Powell said, of course, that -- and as Ms. Smothers said, even if he came back here again, he'd be under the same situation. I mean Congress and sentencing creators have -- the sentencing guidelines authors have seen fit to take those matters in consideration and obviously have felt that persons who have been involved in violent criminal offenses and violent felonies in the past are subject to higher sentences than those, obviously, who have not been so So his past has caught up to some degree with Mr. Lemons and will continue so because of his past offenses. But the court has to take that into consideration and will do so in assessing the sentence in this case.

The court is also to consider a sentence that would reflect the seriousness of the offense, which I've addressed, promote respect for the law, and provide just punishment for the offense, which the court believes the sentence in this case will do.

To afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; basically, send a message to others that the type of conduct as committed in this offense should obviously be avoided and is not to be condoned.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

To protect the public from further crimes of the defendant is a somewhat equivocal factor based upon the fact that Mr. Lemons has not -- at least based on the information I've been provided, has not been involved with the criminal justice system for several years. I think he may have made a lot of sunshine back in the '90s, but at least he's tried to avoid it or has avoided it for several years. And if nothing else, that's certainly indicative that maybe he's trying to move in a different direction.

Finally, provide the defendant with needed educational, vocational training, medical care or other correctional treatment, and the court can certainly craft some conditions that I think maybe would help down the line with Mr. Lemons.

This is a case -- I mean I'm somewhat conflicted to some degree because of what appears to be a relatively high sentence for this matter. But, by the same token, I'm obligated, certainly, to uphold the Constitution and other laws that Congress has established, created. hearing all of the arguments and testimony and other matters that have been reviewed, and the presentence report, the court is going to impose the following sentence in this case. I'm going to impose a sentence that I think is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of 3553(a) and what the court is going to do

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

is impose a sentence of 150 months in this matter. also going to place Mr. Lemons on a period of three years supervised release, along with a \$100 special assessment. I'm not going to impose any fine.

I will recommend that he undergo the 500-hour drug program and also that he will undergo drug treatment and testing as deemed necessary by the probation office, as well as cooperate in the collection of DNA. Obviously, he's not able to possess any firearms.

I will recommend at some point that he be housed in camp housing, but I think at this point he's not going to qualify for that, Ms. Smothers. So I'll make that recommendation.

I don't believe there was any plea agreement in this case, was there?

MS. SMOTHERS: No, sir.

THE COURT: No.

All right, Mr. Powell, any other objections as far as sentencing, any other matters I failed to address on behalf of the government, sir?

MR. POWELL: Did I understand that the court sentenced to 150 months?

THE COURT: That's correct.

MR. POWELL: Below the 180 mandatory minimum.

THE COURT: That's correct, under sufficient

```
1
     but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes
 2
     of 3553(a).
 3
                 MR. POWELL: Well, pursuant to Bostwick, Your
     Honor, the court is aware that the government --
 4
 5
                 THE COURT: You can take it up.
 6
                 MR. POWELL: -- must object to --
 7
                 THE COURT: Yes, sir.
 8
                 MR. POWELL: -- the court's imposition of that
9
     sentence.
10
                 THE COURT: I understand. Anything else?
11
                 Anything else from the defendant?
12
                 MS. SMOTHERS: No, sir.
13
                 THE COURT: You'll have ten days to appeal the
14
     court's determination. Fourteen days, I'm sorry, to appeal
15
     the court's determination. Here's a packet of information
16
     for that purpose.
17
                 All right, anything else?
18
                 MS. SMOTHERS: No, sir.
19
                 MR. POWELL: No, sir.
20
                 THE COURT: All right, you all are excused.
21
           (Proceedings concluded at 2:05 p.m.)
22
23
24
25
```

SENTENCING HEARING PROCEEDINGS
MAY 13, 2010
UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT